

DOW, LOHNES & ALBERTSON

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

1255 TWENTY-THIRD STREET

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20037-1194

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

J.G. HARRINGTON

DIRECT DIAL NO

857-2818

TELEPHONE (202) 857-2500

FACSIMILE (202) 857-2900

June 12, 1995

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Kathleen M. H. Wallman
Chief, Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 500
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

JUN 12 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Re: CC Docket 92-237, IAD File No. 94-102 and
IAD File No. 94-104

WRITTEN EX PARTE PRESENTATION

Dear Ms. Wallman:

I have enclosed a copy of a filing made today before the California Public Utilities Commission requesting the California Commission to order an area code split as the solution to the exhaust of telephone numbers in the 818 area code, which serves the northern part of the Los Angeles area. I am submitting this filing to the Commission because it may be of interest in connection with the above-referenced proceedings.

In accordance with the requirements of Section 1.1206(a)(1) of the Commission's Rules, two copies of this written *ex parte* communication are being submitted to the Secretary's Office on this date.

Respectfully submitted,

J.G. Harrington / RA

Counsel for Cox Enterprises, Inc.

Enclosure

cc (w/encl.): As per attached service list

No. of Copies rec'd
List A B C D E

2

June 12, 1995

Mr. Neal Shulman, Executive Director
Public Utilities Commission of California
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Mr. Shulman:

Pursuant to §§7.5 and 10 of the Central Office Code Assignment Guidelines (ICCF 93-0729-010), as interpreted by the California Code Administrator,¹ the undersigned members of the telecommunications industry submit the attached plan for relief of the forecasted number exhaustion in the 818 Numbering Plan Area ("NPA") for the Commission's expeditious consideration.

This unprecedented procedure results from an impasse reached in the meetings of an industry task force convened to determine the best means of providing relief for the 818 NPA. This impasse resulted directly from the unwillingness of the local exchange companies, Pacific Bell and GTE of California, to accept a relief plan favored by the overwhelming majority of participants. This situation again demonstrates the urgent need to place telephone code administration in the hands of a neutral third party, an issue which deserves the Commission's support before the Federal Communications Commission.²

The proposal, described in greater detail in the attached 818 Area Code Relief Plan, recommends a traditional geographic split for the 818 NPA. It recommends a boundary that generally follows those identified in industry discussions as Alternative 5. This boundary separates the San Fernando Valley and the San Gabriel Valley along natural (i.e. topographical) lines and will thus separate Burbank from North Hollywood and La Crescenta from Sunland-Tujunga. We recommend this boundary as the one the public will best understand because of its topography, the one that best preserves the communities of interest and splits the fewest municipalities, and the

¹ Testimony of Bruce R. Bennett, California Code Administrator, Pacific Bell, Case Nos. 95-01-001 and 94-09-058 (March 13, 1995) at p. 15.

² In the case currently pending before the Commission regarding NPA 310 relief (see n. 1, above), Pacific Bell urged the Commission to relieve it of its duties as California Code Administrator and to work with the Federal Communications Commission to find a replacement Administrator. Testimony of Gwen Moore for Pacific Bell (March 13, 1995) at p. 12.

one that provides the most equal period of relief. The plan proposes to assign the 818 NPA to the San Fernando Valley and a new area code to the San Gabriel Valley to equalize the life of the two NPAs and to mitigate the impact to tandem interconnections concentrated in the San Fernando Valley. While this plan did not achieve unanimous support within the task force, we believe it represents a consensus result, as will be discussed further below and in the attachment.

When it became evident at the industry task force's meetings on May 1 and 2, 1995, that Pacific Bell and GTE California would not permit the industry to achieve unanimity on a relief plan for 818 and would not accept the preference of an overwhelming majority, it was not clear how the task force should proceed. A suggestion to recess until the Commission had issued an order in C.94-09-058 and C.95-01-001 failed. There was tentative agreement that a committee explore the possibility of a survey of customer opinion and preference. However, it has become increasingly clear that agreement on the content and funding of the survey will be as problematic as achieving unanimity on a relief plan. Rather than waste further time, the supporting companies herewith submit their recommendation for 818 NPA relief.


The 818 NPA relief planning process demonstrated the clear potential for "310 all over again." Once again, Pacific Bell and GTE declined to accept as consensus any motion which only they voted against, despite the definition of consensus as "more than a simple majority, but not necessarily unanimity." (See page 5 of the Plan.) Indeed, the same Relief Coordinator who gave California the 310 result in C.94-09-058 and C.95-01-001 was the Coordinator for 818. While the Relief Coordinator in the 619 NPA has truly facilitated a consensus result in a neutral manner, the 818 Coordinator took a strong hand in attempting to direct the outcome. The proceedings have shown that the Relief Coordinator's view of what constituted consensus was heavily influenced by whether or not Pacific Bell was in the majority. The Commission should consider how the California industry should proceed, absent the appointment of a neutral third party to administer the North American Numbering Plan, in handling NPA relief for Number Plan Areas that will soon have to be addressed, such as 213.


If the procedure used in this unprecedented submission requires modification, we await the Commission's direction.

{Continued for signature....}

Respectfully submitted,



for AT&T Communications of
California, Inc.



for MCI Telecommunications
Corporation


for California Cable Television
Association


for Sprint Communications
Company L.P.


Counsel for Cox Enterprises, Inc.


for Teleport Communications
Group


for MFS Intelnet of California,
Inc.

THE 818 AREA CODE RELIEF PLAN

The companies jointly submitting this recommendation propose the relief option identified in industry discussions as Alternative 5. This plan is a traditional geographic split whose boundary separates the San Fernando and San Gabriel Valleys along natural, topographical lines. This boundary would thus divide Burbank from North Hollywood and La Crescenta from Sunland-Tujunga. The public will readily understand this boundary because of its topography; of the split alternatives considered, this one will preserve the greatest number of communities of interest and separate the fewest municipalities. The plan assigns the 818 NPA to the San Fernando Valley and a new NPA to the San Gabriel Valley. This assignment will equalize the life of the two NPAs and mitigate the impact on wireless providers of the concentration of tandem interconnections in the San Fernando Valley. A map displaying this recommendation is attached.¹

The companies sponsoring Alternative 5 recommend the following steps to implement the plan:

¹ Attachment 1.

1. The Commission should order the implementation of Alternative 5, requiring the Local Exchange Companies (LECs) to cooperate fully in notifying customers of the final plan (item 3 below) and related issues (item 5 below), as well as taking other steps necessary to effect the plan. Specifically, the California Code Administrator should be directed to request from the North American Numbering Plan Administrator a new area code for implementation in accordance with the plan described herein.
2. The companies sponsoring Alternative 5 will conduct public meetings within the 818 area in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §7930(b). To meet the timing requirements, these meetings should be conducted no later than September, 1995. These meetings will "give affected subscribers an opportunity to be heard on the potential impact of the proposal, to discuss measures that may be taken to mitigate any potential disruptions and to discuss measures that may be taken to reduce any economic hardships experienced by subscribers and customers, including subscribers and customers with directory listings." Id.
3. The companies will confer following the public meetings to consider the proposal in the light of public input and to issue a final plan no later than the fourth quarter of 1995. This plan will provide the 15 months' notice required by §7930 (c). Such notice should be disseminated in LEC and other telecommunications bills, as well as in press releases.
4. The schedule implicit in the sections above will enable the permissive dialing period to commence as early as April, 1997, to provide as much as 9 months of transition prior to the forecasted exhaust in the first

quarter of 1998. Although Cal. Pub. Util. Code §7931(a) requires 6 months of permissive dialing,² planning for an additional 3 months will provide a cushion of time if code exhaust occurs earlier than currently anticipated. Since the new area code will necessarily be an "interchangeable" NPA (a three-digit number with a middle digit other than "1" or "0"), it would be advisable to notify PBX owners of the need to modify their equipment prior to the end of permissive dialing.

5. The mandatory dialing period will commence in January of 1998. For the next six months, pursuant to §7931(b), callers to numbers moved to the new area code will reach, without charge, a recorded announcement of the new area code unless an exchange is needed for assignment during that time.

BACKGROUND AND BASIS FOR THE PROPOSAL

An industry task force, including representatives of local exchange carriers ("LECs"), wireless providers (cellular, paging, PCS, ESMR), alternative access providers, and prospective competitors to local exchange companies, began to hold meetings in January, 1995, to consider a relief plan for the 818 NPA, which is forecasted to exhaust, based on Pacific Bell's current

² The permissive dialing period is that period during which a telephone number in the new area code may be reached by dialing either the old or new area code.

estimate, in the first quarter of 1998.³ Paula Olivares of Pacific Bell, NPA Relief Coordinator for Los Angeles, coordinated the task force meetings.

At the initial meeting of the industry task force to plan relief for the forecasted exhaust of the 818 NPA, the group agreed upon a definition of consensus and reached consensus on the criteria for a relief plan:

- a) "Consensus is established when substantial agreement has been reached among interest groups participating in the consideration of the subject at hand. Interest groups are those materially affected by the outcome or result. Substantial agreement means more than a simple majority, but not necessarily unanimity. Silence is considered consensus."⁴
- b) Criteria for a Relief Plan: The plan should
 - Minimize impact for end users,
 - provide relief for 818 exhaust,
 - provide long term relief,
 - [have an] equitable impact on all code holders,
 - comply with industry guidelines and regulatory requirements as well as accommodate evolving regulatory policies, and
 - recognize the needs of future code holders.

³ Lists of participants are Attachment 2.

⁴ This definition, without the final sentence, appears in INC 94-1216-004, at p. 11. The last sentence, stated here, is usually assumed.

cc

In addition, the task force identified the general attributes of geographic splits and overlays,⁵ identified eight potential relief alternatives (five splits and three overlays), and reached consensus on the public announcement to be made in March, 1995, that would provide the required 24-month advance notice of an area code change (P.U. Code §7930 (a)). This announcement was subsequently published as a press release and as an insert in customer bills.

At the March meeting, participants discussed NPA studies in Connecticut and Illinois;⁶ identified three additional relief alternatives, making a total of eleven; and discussed and compared all of the relief alternatives, eliminating several (Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, and 11). A subcommittee was appointed to work with the Relief Coordinator to develop answers to customer questions regarding the public announcement.

The goal of the April meeting was to reach consensus on a final proposal and to plan for public meetings. A participant provided a spreadsheet study

⁵ See Attachment 3.

⁶ In addition to these studies (attached) which were discussed in the 310 proceeding, another study conducted in Oregon (also attached) reinforces the substantial preference for splits (83%) among residential consumers and business customers, especially large business customers.

comparing the longevity of various alternatives and also provided text from pending federal legislation (Pressler) which appeared to preclude the use of overlays. Four Alternatives remained under consideration: three splits (Alternatives 2, 5 and 9) and one overlay (Alternative 6). Discussions of these possibilities resulted in the elimination of Alternative 2 because of its short life. Alternative 9, a double split, was also discussed at the April and May meetings. It was shelved because of technical problems GTE California ("GTEC") raised and the political issues that could result from multiple split boundaries, but was not eliminated, because of the extremely long period of relief it offered. This left two main options: Alternative 5 and Alternative 6.

Alternative 5 is a traditional geographic split with a boundary running between the San Fernando and San Gabriel Valleys. The San Fernando Valley would retain the 818 area code because of the concentration of wireless interconnections there and the need to equalize the expected life of the two NPAs. The San Gabriel Valley would be assigned a new area code. This boundary is a well-known topographical feature within the area, one that customers will readily understand, and one that will separate the fewest communities of interest among the split options considered. The Relief Coordinator ruled that a motion to adopt this Alternative as the recommended plan failed to achieve consensus.

Alternative 6, an overlay, would stack a new area code on top of the present 818 area. There was disagreement, however, concerning the dialing plan to be used with the overlay. After an extended discussion of dialing arrangements in Alternative 6, nine companies (wireless providers and prospective competitive local carriers [CLCs]) declared a preference for 1 + 10-digit dialing within the home NPA because it

- was recommended in industry NPA Code Relief Guidelines,⁷
- partially mitigated competitive issues,
- mitigated problems for business customers,
- resulted in less customer confusion, and
- was in use in overlays elsewhere.

Two companies (Pacific Bell and GTEC) preferred 7-digit dialing within the home NPA and 1 + 10 between NPAs because

- dialing consistency within the state was important,
- 10-digit (or 1 + 10-digit) dialing statewide would be burdensome for other NPAs, and
- permissive 10-digit dialing is available already.

⁷ INC 94-1216-004, Section 5.3.

The Relief Coordinator ruled that a motion to adopt Alternative 6 failed to gain consensus. Participants agreed to consult with their companies and meet in May to try to break the deadlock.

At the meetings held on May 1 and 2, the participants discussed two proposals. One was a stipulation offered by an interexchange carrier which included provisions acknowledging

- that permanent service provider local number portability would probably not be available by the date of code exhaust in 818, and
- the recommendation of 10-digit dialing within any overlay NPA in industry guidelines.

The stipulation proposed that the task force accept Alternative 5 as a consensus plan and that an overlay plan be considered for subsequent relief of 818 (after the availability of provider local number portability). The stipulation also proposed a condition that sought to mitigate the impact of geographic splits on wireless customers who must bring in their cellular phones and pagers to be reprogrammed:

"Wireless providers will not be required to return existing telephone numbers. Existing wireless customers in the new NPA may retain current telephone numbers. Local Exchange Companies will continue to route calls for current wireless customers without change to current points of interconnection after the implementation of the new NPA and maintain current routing arrangements. New wireless customers in the new NPA will be assigned numbers in the new NPA."

This condition was discussed at some length, concluding with a proposal by PageNet to eliminate all but the first sentence which was revised to read: "Codeholders including holders of partial codes will retain current 7-digit telephone numbers." Although it does not capture the intent of the condition as originally worded, this change was not opposed. Thereafter, a vote was taken on the stipulation. The vote tally was 11 for, 3 against (GTEC, Pacific Bell and Pacific Bell Mobile Services), and 4 abstentions. The Relief Coordinator ruled that this was not sufficient to achieve consensus.

A vote was also taken on Alternative 6, resulting in 4 for, 6 against, and 8 abstentions. The large number of abstentions were by wireless carriers, who did not support the proposal because its dialing arrangement was undecided, but did not oppose it either.

During the discussions on May 1, one of Pacific Bell's voting representatives stated that it was Pacific Bell's view that any potential competitive impacts of an area code relief plan on new entrants were "irrelevant" in deciding what plan to adopt. This representative also indicated that Pacific Bell would not give any consideration to such competitive impacts in its evaluation of relief plans. A new entrant requested that this statement be reflected in meeting notes, but it did not appear in the initial draft.

The second proposal was sponsored by a group of wireless providers and proposed the following steps:

- conduct public meetings that would present two or more relief options and solicit input from the public,
- develop customer input via telephone surveys or questionnaires,
- defer further action until the CPUC has ruled in the 310 Complaint and incorporate that ruling into the 818 proposal.

Participants expressed concern about the difficulty of getting “authentic public input,” (i.e., unstaged reactions and representative input) at such public meetings. Some objected to treating the public meetings as a referendum. Participants also objected to waiting for CPUC direction as an abdication of industry responsibility. The wireless companies’ proposal, other than the suggestion to consider a survey for public input, failed to gain general support.

If the public meetings were to present two options, it seemed clear that Alternative 5 would be one of them. There was no agreement, however, about whether Alternative 6 would be presented with a 7-digit or a 1 + 10-digit intraNPA dialing arrangement. Because of this impasse, a motion was made that Alternative 5 was the only plan sufficiently defined for public presentation. This motion passed by the following vote: 13 for, 3 against (Pacific Bell, Pacific Bell Mobile Services, GTEC), with

4 abstentions. The Relief Coordinator ruled that this majority was not sufficient to achieve consensus.

There was also a motion to suspend meetings until the CPUC issued an order in the 310 Complaint proceedings (C.94-09-058, C.95-01-001). The vote on this motion was 9 for, 3 opposed, 4 abstentions.⁸ The Relief Coordinator initially ruled that this majority was sufficient to achieve consensus. Members of the task force noted, however, that the Relief Coordinator had previously ruled that similar majorities did not constitute consensus. She then ruled that consensus had not been achieved. There was discussion about obtaining customer input on relief issues by survey (written or telephone) or focus group, and tentative agreement was reached to pursue this suggestion in committee. Thereafter, the task force adjourned.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing clearly demonstrates that only GTEC, Pacific Bell and one of its subsidiaries (Pacific Bell Mobile Services) have prevented an industry task force from reaching unanimity on a relief plan for the 818 NPA. According to the definition of consensus adopted by the task force, however,

⁸ The difference in the total number of votes reflects different attendance on May 1 and May 2.

unanimity is not required, and silence (i.e. abstention) was agreed to constitute consensus. The companies submitting this plan believe that consensus was effectively reached on Alternative 5, either as incorporated in the stipulation or as characterized as the only relief plan sufficiently well-defined to present to the public at meetings. Accordingly, the parties submitting this Plan urge the Commission to approve it and to direct the California Code Administrator to take all steps necessary to implement it.

The difficulties experienced by *all* participants in the 818 task force were an inevitable result of NPA relief being required at the same time the local exchange market is expected to be opened. Since overlay plans by their nature create unequal NPAs -- with the old NPA used by all established customers and the new NPA a vacant lot -- it is not surprising, but it is surely disappointing, that some parties maneuvered solely for competitive advantage, forcing others to struggle to level the playing field.

In this transition period, the *form* of NPA relief selected has great potential to harm or benefit both consumers and competing telecommunications providers. In time, permanent service provider local number portability will obviate the need for much of this controversy. Until those steps have been taken, a geographic split will provide the most competitively-neutral form of NPA relief possible. Geographic splits *will still provide a substantial*


challenge to CLCs in the absence of permanent local number portability, since customers prefer not to change their 7-digit numbers, but at least splits do not make local exchange competition essentially Infeasible for new entrants, as the overlay would, especially with the dialing arrangement (7-digit intraNPA) insisted upon by the incumbent local companies.

Indeed, it is important for the Commission to implement local number portability expeditiously and consider the competitive problems with the monopoly LEC dialing plan so that overlays may become available as an acceptable form of relief before Number Plan Areas in California become difficult to divide further. Until then, the submitting parties strongly urge the Commission to approve this Plan and require the California Code Administrator to take all steps necessary to its implementation.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Map of 818 NPA illustrating split boundary.
2. Lists of Participants.
3. Attributes of Overlays and Geographic Splits
4. Central Office Code Assignment Guidelines, ICCF 93-0729-101
(10/26/94).
5. NPA Relief Planning Guidelines, INC 94-1216-004 (12/16/94).
6. Stipulation.
7. Meeting Notes.
8. Connecticut Study
9. Illinois Study
10. Oregon Study

818 NPA Area Map / Alternative 5



818 NPA Roster

NAME	COMPANY	ADDRESS	PHONE	FAX	MEETING
Angle, Ed	Pacific Bell	2600 Camino Ramon, 2S155, San Ramon CA 94583	510-823-2920	510-867-1208	1/18, 1/19
Baker, Les	Pacific Bell Legal	2600 Camino Ramon, Rm 3W903, San Ramon CA 94583	510-823-5323	510-355-9344	1/18, 1/19
Ballard, Betty	Pacific Bell	2600 Camino Ramon, 2E200E, San Ramon CA 94583	510-867-5889	510-355-7936	1/18, 1/19
Banuelos, JP	Pacific Bell Regulatory	140 New Montgomery, Room 2408, San Francisco CA 94105	415-542-4402	415-546-4119	1/19
Barr, Dodie	PageNet	4965 Preston Park Blvd, Suite 600, Plano TX 75093	214-985-6247	214-985-6519	1/18, 1/19
Beade, Ken	Pacific Bell Ind Market	1470 Enea Circle, Room 1550, Concord	510-671-8281	510-671-8244	1/18, 1/19
Bennett, Bruce	California Code Admin	2600 Camino Ramon, Room 2S155, San Ramon CA 94583	510-823-2880	510-867-1208	1/18
Berg, David	Mobilecomm of the West	101 S First Street, Suite 300, Burbank CA 91502	818-955-4388	818-955-4397	1/18, 1/19
Blakkan, Gwen	AirTouch Cellular	3 Park Plaza, PO Bx 19707, Irvine CA 92713-9707	714-222-7713	714-222-8982	1/18, 1/19
Chatterjee, Asok	Nextel Comm	3675 Mount Diablo Blvd, Ste 330, Lafayette CA 94549	510-299-3007	510-299-2373	
Cocks, Joe	GTE Industry Affairs	One GTE Place, MC500GCB, Thousand Oaks CA 91362	805-372-7647	805-372-7321	1/18
Coons, Fred	Teleport Comm Group	700 S Flower, Suite 810, Los Angeles CA 90017	213-787-0030	213-787-0099	1/19
Cooper, Andrea	Pacific Bell	2600 Camino Ramon, Room 2S155, San Ramon CA 94583	510-823-2966	510-867-1208	1/18, 1/19
Cratty, Scott	AT&T	795 Folsom, Room 285, San Francisco	415-442-2310	415-442-2357	
Curtis, A. Don	Pacific Bell	2600 Camino Ramon, 3E050E, San Ramon CA 94583	510-901-8227	510-901-0401	1/18, 1/19
Domenicelli, Ronald	GT Mobile	4410 Rosewood Dr, Pleasanton CA 94588	510-416-7640	510-224-8106	
Douding, Kathy	ICG	_____, Oakland	510-769-5310	510-769-5737	
Duff, Eileen	McCaw Cellular	1750 Howe Ave, 3rd Floor, Sacramento CA 95825	916-648-7938	_____	
Dunne, Ronnie	Pacific Bell Opr Svcs	2600 Camino Ramon, Room 3E000A, San Ramon CA 94583			1/18, 1/19

818 NPA Roster

Eichelkraut, Dave	AT&T	2121 E 63rd Street, Room C500I, Kansas City MO 64130	816-995-3230	816-822-6790	1/18, 1/19
Fox, Russell	Nationwide Paging	2313 W Burbank Bl, Burbank CA 91506	818-840-1800	818-840-1823	1/18, 1/19
Franco, Mary	Pacific Bell	177 E Colorado Blvd, Room 300, Pasadena CA 91105	818-578-3804	818-449-7252	1/18, 1/19
Frank, Bill	AirTouch Paging	2401 E Katella Avenue, Room 150, Anaheim CA 92806	714-938-2903	714-938-1436	1/18, 1/19
Garrity, Joe	MCI	707 17th St, Suite 3900, Denver CO 80202	303-291-6547	303-291-6333	
Grigsby, Geoff	Sprint	1850 Gateway Dr, 7th Floor, San Mateo CA 94404	415-513-2732	415-513-2737	1/18, 1/19
Harrington, J. G.	Dow Lohnes & Albertson	1255 23rd St NW, Suite 500, Washington DC 20037	202-857-2500	202-857-2900	1/18, 1/19
Henricks, Don	Pacific Bell	Pacific Bell, Room 880, 177 E Colorado Blvd, Pasadena CA	818-578-4147	818-792-6862	1/19
Holguin, Diane M.	Pacific Bell	177 E Colorado Blvd, Room 880, Pasadena CA 91105	818-578-4111	818-792-6862	1/18, 1/19
Isbell, Steven	GTE Paging	One GTE Place, CA500UA1, Thousand Oaks CA 91362	805-372-5091	805-495-0339	
Johns, Jennifer	California Cable TV	4341 Piedmon Av, PO Bx 11080, Oakland CA 94611	510-428-2225	510-428-0151	1/18, 1/19
Keating, Steve	All City Paging	18321 Ventura Blvd, Room 200, Tarzana CA 91356	818-705-1936	818-705-1834	
Lee, Steven	AirSignal	5855 Green Valley Cir, Suite 103, Culver City CA 90230	310-641-2366	310-641-2342	1/18
Mahoney, Phil	Pacific Bell Info Tech	2600 Camino Ramon, Rm 2E700R, San Ramon CA 94583	510-867-6669	510-823-7025	1/18
Malmquist, Jane	AirTouch	3 Park Plaza, PO Bx 19707, Irvine CA 92713	714-222-7607	714-222-8982	1/18, 1/19
Milby, Wayne	Bell Atlantic	10 N Mansemond St, Richmond VA 23221	804-772-5437	804-772-5079	1/18, 1/19
Morris, Michael	Teleport Comm Group	One Bush Street, Suite 510, San Francisco CA 94104	415-276-0013	415-276-0050	1/18, 1/19
Mosley, Walter	ATT - Govt Affairs	795 Folsom, RM 285, San Francisco	415-442-2418	415-442-2357	1/18, 1/19
O'Krent, Mark	The Telephone Conn	9911 W Pico Blvd, Suite 680, Los Angeles CA 90035	310-551-7717	310-823-8157	
Olivares, Paula	NPA Relief Coordinator	177 E Colorado Blvd, Room 880, Pasadena CA 91105	818-578-4136	818-792-6862	1/19

818 NPA Roster

Owens, David	LA Cellular	17785 Center Crt Dr No, Cerritos CA 90701	310-403-8553	310-403-1970	1/19
Page, Steve	GTE	800 N Haven, Suite 200, Ontario CA 91764	909-481-5281	909-989-3663	1/18
Phillips, Laura	Dow Lohnes & Albertson	1255 23rd St NW, Suite 500, Washington DC 20037	202-857-2500	202-857-2900	
Pope, Pam	Pacific Bell	2600 Camino Ramon, Room 4W700V, San Ramon CA 94583	510-867-8643	510-277-0253	1/18, 1/19
Radigan, Julio	GTE Mobilnet, Inc.	4410 Rosewood Dr, Pleasanton CA 94588	510-416-7642	510-224-8105	1/18
Rosen, Art	AirTouch Paging	2401 E Katella Avenue, Room 150, Anaheim CA 92806	714-938-2950	714-938-1436	1/18
Silvestre, Donna	CPUC	8141 E 2nd, #310, Downey CA 90241-3645	310-869-0803	310-904-2168	1/18, 1/19
Skinner, Max	MCI Telecomm - West Div	707 17th St, Ste 4200, Denver CO 80202	303-291-6536	303-291-6333	
Stroshane, Geneva	GTE California	One GTE Place, CA500VI, Thousand Oaks CA 91362	805-372-8052	805-372-7001	1/18, 1/19
Tedesco, Greg	AirTouch Communications	2785 Mitchell Dr, MS8-2, Walnut Creek CA 94598	510-279-6612	510-279-6318	1/18
Warren, Greg	Pagenet of Ontario	3401 Centre Lake Drive, Ontario CA 91761	909-984-7777	909-984-7448	
Wenrick, Kathryn	PageMart	6688 N Central Exprsway, Dallas TX 75206	214-706-3522	214-750-4593	1/19
White, Sandy	GTE	One GTE Place, CA500DG, Thousand Oaks CA 91362	805-372-7693	805-373-8569	1/18
Willis, Robert	Pacific Bell	2600 Camino Ramon, Room 3N000P, San Ramon CA 94583	510-823-7803	510-830-2763	1/18, 1/19

**818 INDUSTRY MEETING
MAY 1&2, 1995**

INITIAL	NAME	COMPANY	STREET ADDRESS	ROOM	CITY	PHONE	FAX
_____	ALEXANDER Bonnie	Cellular Service	6100 San Fernando Rd	_____	Glendale CA 91201	213-245-0444	818-242-0802 (FAX)
_____	ANGLE Ed	Pacific Bell	2600 Camino Ramon	RM 2S155	San Ramon CA 94583	510-823-2920	510-867-1208 (FAX)
<i>R.B.</i>	BAKER Les	Pacific Bell Legal	2600 Camino Ramon	RM 3W903	San Ramon CA 94583	510-823-5323	510-355-9344 (FAX)
_____	BALDASARO Jim	Pac Bell Mobile Svcs	_____	_____	_____	510-227-3086	510-227-3079 (FAX)
<i>BB</i>	BALLARD Betty	Pacific Bell	2600 Camino Ramon	2E200E	San Ramon CA 94583	510-867-5889	510-355-7936 (FAX)
<i>JB</i>	BANUELOS JP	Pacific Bell Regulatory	140 New Montgomery	RM 2408	San Francisco CA 94105	415-542-4402	415-543-7636 (FAX)
<i>DB</i>	BARR Dodie	PageNet	4965 Preston Park Blvd	Suite 600	Plano TX 75093	214-985-2943	214-985-6519 (FAX)
<i>KB</i>	BEADE Ken	Pacific Bell Ind Market	1470 Enea Circle	RM 1550	Concord	510-871-8281	510-871-8244 (FAX)
_____	BEADLESTON Paul	MCI	201 Spear St	9th Floor	San Francisco CA 94105	415-978-1230	415-978-1012 (FAX)
<i>JB</i>	BENNETT Bruce	California Code Admin	2600 Camino Ramon	RM 2S155	San Ramon CA 94583	510-823-2880	510-867-1208 (FAX)
_____	BERG David	Mobilecomm of the West	101 S First Street	Suite 300	Burbank CA 91502	818-955-4388	818-972-3779 (FAX)
_____	BERMAN Jeff	International Page	225 S Lake Av	6th Floor	Pasadena CA 91101	818-449-8850	818-449-0175 (FAX)
_____	BERNAL Michael	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	BHAGA Randy	Pacific Bell	_____	_____	_____	818-578-3886	818-281-8845 (FAX)
_____	BIDMON Bob	Message Center Beeper	40 Woodland St	_____	Hartford CT 06105-2390	800-359-2337	203-520-2465 (FAX)
_____	BILLIP Martin	Smartsmr (Nextel)	624 S Grand Av	Suite 900	Los Angeles CA 90017	213-312-3031	213-312-1212 (FAX)
<i>GB</i>	BLAKKAN Gwen	AirTouch Cellular	3 Park Plaza	PO Bx 19707	Irvine CA 92714	714-222-7713	714-222-8982 (FAX)
<i>JB</i>	BONNIKEN Linda	Pacific Bell	1010 Wishire Bl	RM 1665	Los Angeles CA	213-975-5081	213-482-2646 (FAX)
_____	CHATTERJEE Asok	Nextel Comm	3675 Mount Diablo Blvd	Ste 330	Lafayette CA 94549	510-299-3007	510-299-2373 (FAX)
_____	CHEUNG Amy	CPUC	_____	_____	_____	415-703-1250	_____
_____	CHOI Tony	Pacific Bell	_____	_____	_____	619-586-3485	619-549-2072 (FAX)

**818 INDUSTRY MEETING
MAY 1&2, 1995**

INITIAL	NAME	COMPANY	STREET ADDRESS	ROOM	CITY	PHONE	FAX
<u>JRC</u>	COCKE Joe	GTE Industry Affairs	One GTE Place	MC500GCB	Thousand Oaks CA 91362	805-372-7647	805-372-7321 (FAX)
_____	COONS Fred	Teleport Comm Group	700 S Flower	Suite 810	Los Angeles CA 90017	213-787-0030	213-787-0099 (FAX)
<u>Am L</u>	COOPER Andrea	Pacific Bell	2600 Camino Ramon	RM 2S155	San Ramon CA 94583	510-823-2988	510-867-1208 (FAX)
_____	CRATTY Scott	AT&T	795 Folsom	RM 285	San Francisco	415-442-2310	415-442-2357 (FAX)
_____	CURTIS A. Don	Pacific Bell Opr Svc	2600 Camino Ramon	3E050E	San Ramon CA 94583	510-901-8227	510-901-0401 (FAX)
_____	DICKSTEIN David	Pacific Bell	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
<u>EA</u>	DITIRRO Tony	<u>MCI</u>	<u>201 SPEAR ST</u>	<u>9th floor</u>	<u>S. F. 94105</u>	<u>415 978-2025</u>	<u>415 978-1094</u>
_____	DOMENICELLI Ronald	GT Mobilnet, Inc.	4410 Rosewood Dr	_____	Pleasanton CA 94588	510-416-7640	510-224-8106 (FAX)
_____	DOUDING Kathy	ICG	180 Grand Ave	Suite 1000	Oakland CA 94612	510-769-5310	510-769-5737 (FAX)
<u>917</u>	DUFF Eileen	McCaw Cellular	1750 Howe Ave	3rd Floor	Sacramento CA 95825	916-848-7938	916-848-8547 (FAX)
_____	DUNNE Ronnie	Pacific Bell Opr Svcs	2600 Camino Ramon	RM 3E050T	San Ramon CA 94583	510-823-8956	510-275-9760 (FAX)
<u>EL</u>	DURAN Ed	LA Cellular	17785 Center Court Dr N	_____	Cerritos CA 90703-8275	213-400-0014	310-403-1823 (FAX)
_____	EICHELKRAUT Dave	AT&T	2121 E 63rd Street	RM C500I	Kansas City MO 64130	816-995-3230	816-822-8790 (FAX)
<u>RF</u>	FOX Russell	Nationwide Paging	2313 W Burbank Bl	_____	Burbank CA 91508	818-840-1800	818-840-1823 (FAX)
<u>MLE</u>	FRANCO Mary	Pacific Bell	177 E Colorado Blvd	RM 300	Pasadena CA 91105	818-578-3808	818-449-7252 (FAX)
_____	FRANK Bill	AirTouch Paging	2401 E Katella Avenue	RM 150	Anaheim CA 92808	714-938-2903	714-938-1436 (FAX)
<u>AT</u>	GABRIELLIAN Anita	Pacific Bell	1010 Wishire Bl	RM 1601	Los Angeles	213-975-8228	213-250-7263 (FAX)
_____	GARRITY Joe	MCI	707 17th St	Suite 3900	Denver CO 80202	303-291-8547	303-291-8333 (FAX)
_____	GILCREASE Joyce	Pacific Bell	_____	_____	_____	619-588-2259	619-693-3869 (FAX)
_____	GOEDEAL Donald	National Page	1224 Village Way	Suite A	Santa Ana CA 92705	800-895-7243	714-864-1667 (FAX)
_____	GONSALVES Cliff	U S West	_____	_____	_____	619-571-4100	619-571-4112 (FAX)

**818 INDUSTRY MEETING
MAY 1&2, 1995**

INITIAL	NAME	COMPANY	STREET ADDRESS	ROOM	CITY	PHONE	FAX
	GRIGSBY Geoff	Sprint	1850 Gateway Dr	7th Floor	San Mateo CA 94404	415-513-2732	415-513-2737 (FAX)
	HARRINGTON J. G.	Dow Lohnes & Albertson	1255 23rd St NW	Suite 500	Washington DC 20037	202-857-2500	202-857-2900 (FAX)
_____	HENRICKS Don	Pacific Bell	100 N Stoneman	RM 200	Alhambra CA 91801	818-308-8860	818-289-1553 (FAX)
_____	HOLGUIN Diane M.	Pacific Bell	100 N Stoneman	RM 200	Alhambra CA 91801	818-308-8860	818-289-1553 (FAX)
_____	HORTON Rick	Pronet Medical	5875 Rickenbacher Rd	_____	City Commerce CA 90040	213-721-2277	213-722-4130 (FAX)
_____	ISELL Steven	GTE Paging	One GTE Place	CA500UA1	Thousand Oaks CA 91362	805-372-5091	805-495-0339 (FAX)
_____	JACKSON Rebecca	Comtech	105 Commerce Circle	Suite D	Sacramento CA 95815	916-567-3222	916-567-8229 (FAX)
_____	JAUPLIN Shaun	Nextel	_____	_____	_____	213-312-3454	_____
	JOHNS Jennifer	California Cable TV	4341 Piedmont Av	PO Bx 11080	Oakland CA 94611	510-428-2225	510-428-0151 (FAX)
	KEATING Steve	Metrocall	18321 Ventura Blvd	RM 200	Tarzana CA 91356	818-705-1936	818-705-1834 (FAX)
	KENWORTH Pamela	MFS Intelenet	6 Century Dr	Suite 300	Parsippany NJ 07054	201-938-7387	201-938-7710 (FAX)
_____	LEE Steven	AirSignal	5855 Green Valley Cir	Suite 103	Culver City CA 90230	310-641-2366	310-641-2342 (FAX)
_____	LEVY Mark	MFS Telecom Inc	9805 Scranton	Suite 101	San Diego CA 92121	213-489-4637	213-489-3712 (FAX)
_____	LINDEN Hal	Pageprompt	16810 Valley View	_____	La Mirada CA 90638	714-670-0777	714-582-0522 (FAX)
	LOPEZ Sonia	Pac Bell Mobile Svcs	1420 Pispan Dr Bldg 2	4th Floor	Pleasanton, CA 94583	510-227-3086	510-227-3079 (FAX)
_____	MAHONEY Phil	Pacific Bell Info Tech	2800 Camino Ramon	Rm 2E700R	San Ramon CA 94583	510-867-6669	510-823-7025 (FAX)
_____	MALMQUIST Jane	AirTouch	3 Park Plaza	PO Bx 19707	Irvine CA 92713	714-222-7607	714-222-8982 (FAX)
_____	MILBY Wayne	Bell Atlantic	10 N Nansemond St	RM 127	Richmond VA 23221	804-772-5437	804-772-5079 (FAX)
	MORRIS Michael	Teleport Comm Group	201 N Civic Dr	Suite 210	Walnut Creek CA 94596	510-279-5113	510-279-5114 (FAX)
	MOSLEY Walter	ATT - Govt Affairs	795 Folsom	RM 265	San Francisco	415-442-2418	415-442-2357 (FAX)
	MOSSBARGER Jim	Mobilemedia Comm	6 Centrepointe Dr	Suite 640	La Palma CA 90623	714-228-4400	714-670-4181 (FAX)